

for many years, those countries have their own approach. In Israel, for example, the country provides the insurance for the terrorist attacks. The Banking Committee and the Commerce Committee both have sought to craft legislation to say there ought to be a backstop with respect to antiterrorism legislation, that initially the insurance companies themselves should put up money and absorb the losses, to the tune of \$10 or \$15 billion, but after that there should be a sharing of the costs that grow out of terrorist attacks. The Federal Government should share that. It is unfortunate we were not able to proceed with this legislation today, and it is imperative we take it up as soon as we return.

The last point is with respect to other unfinished business. When terrorists attacked us on September 11, they didn't just take people's lives in New York, the Pentagon, and in Pennsylvania; they struck a body blow to our economy. We are still reeling, to some extent, from that body blow. The work of the Federal Reserve on monetary policy helps us with respect to that body blow.

The fact that energy prices have fallen so much helps us with respect to that body blow. The fact that we are spending, frankly, a lot of money with deficit spending, in order to fight terrorism here and across the country and around the world, provides stimulus to the economy and helps to reduce the length of time under which we will likely have a recession.

There is one other thing we could have done, and ought to have done, besides the terrorism reinsurance proposal that has been objected to, and that was to pass an economic recovery plan. That, I think, had broad bipartisan support by Democrats and Republicans. It would have accelerated depreciation and gotten businesses back into the business of making capital investment. It would have provided a payroll tax holiday for businesses and employees as well. It would have provided extensions of unemployment insurance and helped folks on the health insurance side. It would have helped States that are reeling at this point in time. Unfortunately, we have not had the opportunity to debate that today and to pass a true bipartisan plan.

So we go home with half a loaf. We go home with half a loaf, but, as the Presiding Officer knows, we will come back next month. And as we come back next month, my hope is, if we have not dealt satisfactorily with railroad security and port security today, if we have not dealt with antiterrorism reinsurance today, as it appears we will not, that once we return we will take that up.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when I complete my request for the unanimous consent, the Senator from West Virginia be recognized.

He has time under the previous bill already, but I would like him to be recognized as soon as I finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Reserving the right to object, I have one unanimous consent request I would like to make regarding an immigration bill before, if possible, the Senator from West Virginia speaks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, the Senators may be unaware, but under the previous order, I was to be recognized after the vote; right?

Mr. REID. Right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the understanding of the Chair that Senators INOUE and STEVENS were to be recognized after the vote. And the Senator agreed to delay his statement, but the time had not been allotted to him specifically.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I know what my rights are, and I know what the order said. I just have not pressed my rights. But I have no objection to the Senator making his request. I will not, however, stand aside for the Senator's request, but I will be here when he makes his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Is my consent granted then, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3448

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to H.R. 3448, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3448) to improve the ability of the United States to prevent, prepare for, and respond to bioterrorism and other public health emergencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure at this time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I shall not object. I thank my colleague from West Virginia for his patience and tolerance, and also my colleague from Nevada for his assistance in moving this forward, as well as Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT. And I congratulate Senator FRIST and Senator KENNEDY for the work they have done in putting together this bipartisan Bioterrorism Preparedness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to this measure at this time?

Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the measure.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say also that the Senator from West Virginia

and I worked very hard on homeland security, which featured a lot of these matters in this legislation that will quickly be approved. And it was real money. This is not; this is an authorization. I am glad we are going to get this, but it would have been better had we done Senator BYRD's bill and mine.

Mr. President, I understand Senators FRIST, KENNEDY, and GREGG have a substitute amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. 1765. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered and agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that the bill, as amended, be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object. I do not know what this bill is about.

Mr. REID. Did the Senator from West Virginia hear my statement I just made?

Mr. BYRD. I could hardly hear anything, as a matter of fact.

Mr. REID. What I did say, I say to Senator BYRD, is that this is the authorization on which Senators KENNEDY and FRIST have worked. And I did say that the legislation you offered—with me being second in charge of that legislation—was real money, appropriated money, which would have done these things that this only authorizes. I am glad this is going to be authorized, but it is too bad we are not here celebrating real money for the people.

Mr. BYRD. I object to this bill. I object to this being considered at this time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my consent to lay this bill down be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I will just state to my friend and colleague from West Virginia, he is very much my friend, and I know he has a Defense appropriations speech, and I look forward to hearing his comments on that, and then I look forward to working with him to kind of show him some of the provisions on which Senators FRIST, KENNEDY, and GREGG, and others have worked. I believe there are 75 or more cosponsors on this bill. I think it is a good bill, a bipartisan bill, strongly supported by both sides.

I will work with my colleague from West Virginia to acquaint him with that. I hope and expect we can pass it a little later this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have been more than patient. Under the majority leader's order earlier, I was to